

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is submitted in conjunction with a concurrently filed Request for Continued Examination and in response to the final Office Action dated November 3, 2005 and Advisory Action dated January 20, 2006.

Claims 38-52 are pending in the application.

In the present amendment, allowable claim 38 has been amended to define more generally that the angle provided between a longitudinal axis of a given one of said blade sections and one of said radially outer cutting edges is larger than an angle between said longitudinal axis and one of said radially inner cutting edges. The Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 38 still defines a patentably distinct set of features that is not disclosed by Corcoran.

Corcoran discloses a cutting blade with cutting edges 16, which are trapezoidal. The cutting blades 16 are divided into two partial sections by a breaking or bending line 24. According to Fig. 1 of Corcoran and the related description, the cutting edges are made from a flat or smooth blank, which is bent into a spatial shape. In the flat blank of Fig. 1, the cutting edges run linearly. With regard to the longitudinal axis in the cutting blades, the inner cutting edges have the same angle relative to this longitudinal axis as the outer cutting edges of the outer section 22. This feature also does not change when the flat blank of Fig. 1 is bent into the spatial shape of Fig. 3. The angle between the cutting edges and the longitudinal axis does not change and remains the same. The cutting edges of the outer section have the same angle to the longitudinal axis as the cutting edges of the inner section.

A structure, in which the outer cutting edges lie at a greater angle to the longitudinal axis than the inner cutting edges, is not disclosed by Corcoran. Therefore, the subject matter of claim 38 is not anticipated by the Corcoran reference.

The cited reference to Juncker discloses another cutting blade with trapezoid-shaped cutting edges. The Examiner maintains that the embodiment of Fig. 7 of this reference has a double trapezoid shape opposite an imaginary transverse axis. However, the angle between the outer cutting edges and the longitudinal axis is smaller than that between the inner cutting edges and the same longitudinal axis. Again, claim 38 defines that the "angle provided between a longitudinal axis of a given one of said blade sections and one of said radially outer cutting edges is larger than an angle between said longitudinal axis and one of said radially inner cutting edges". Claim 38 therefore also is not anticipated by the Juncker reference.

Even if the Corcoran and Juncker reference were combined, one of skill in the art would not be led to the present invention. Both references teach with regard to the longitudinal axis choosing either a cutting angle that remains the same or one that becomes smaller in the radial direction. Claim 38 of the present application, however, provides a tapering double-trapezoid shape, in which the cutting angle to the longitudinal axis is greater in the radial outer direction. Thus, radially inwardly, a tapering with a small angle is provided, and radially outwardly, a tapering with a larger angle is provided. Neither Corcoran nor Juncker provides any suggestion with regard to these features.

Also in this amendment, claims 38-42 have been amended to clarify which edges are the "cutting edges". In addition, new claims 48-52 have been added, all of

which depend on claim 38 and define additional limitations. The features of new claim 48 were defined in the previous version of claim 38, and the features of new claim 38 were provided in claim 43. Support for the features of new claim 50 can be found in the specification on page 4, second paragraph and page 5, first paragraph. Support for new claim 51 can be found on page 12, second paragraph, and support for new claim 52 can be found on page 8, second paragraph.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the Applicants respectfully submit that all of claims 38-52 are patentable over the cited art of record. In addition, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call from him to discuss any outstanding issues, and in particular any further amendments to the claims to bring the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Becker, Reg. 26,255
Attorney for Applicant(s)

ROBERT W. BECKER & ASSOCIATES

707 Highway 66 East, Suite B
Tijeras, New Mexico 87059

Telephone: 505 286 3511
Telefax: 505 286 3524

RWB:mac